

REMARKS

This is in response to an Office Action that was mailed on May 28, 2009. Claims 1-36 were pending in that action and all claims were rejected. With the present response, claims 1-24 and 26-35 are amended. Claim 36 is cancelled. New claim 41 is added.

Beginning on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,704,744, which is attributed to Williamson, in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,315,849, which is attribute to Bakalash. For reasons that will be described in detail below, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims, including the many amendments proposed with the present response, are patentably distinguishable from the cited references considered independently or in combination.

With the present response, Applicant has amended claim 1 substantially. This independent claim now requires generation of a dimensional object model and analytical programming object model from an object model description that describes an object model utilized in collecting business data. Further, the claim now requires an automatic identification of a data navigation path between a set of business data and the object model and a set of business data in the analytical programming model.

The cited Williamson reference deals only with an object model and a relational model that includes tables in a database management system. The cited Bakalash reference describes a database management system involving an on-line analytical processing data warehouse component. However, neither of the cited references teaches or suggests generating both a dimensional object model and an analytical programming object model as claimed. Certainly the cited references fail to teach or suggest automatically identifying a data navigation path between a set of business data in the object model and a set of business data in the analytical programming model. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is in allowable form.

Further, claim 1 now also requires responding to selection of the claim automatically identified data navigation path by transitioning a display between a display of the set of business data in the object model and the set of business data in the analytical programming model. In

addition to not teaching or suggesting automatic identification of a data navigation path as claimed, the references also fail to teach or suggest automatically transitioning between display as claimed. For these additional reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is in allowable form.

Dependent claims 2-16 are dependent upon independent claim 1 and are believed to be in allowable form at least for their dependence upon what is believed to be an allowable claim. Further, it is respectfully submitted that some or all of these dependent claims are allowable based on the merit of their own limitations.

For example, dependent claim 3 further limits the step of generating the analytical programming object model to requiring a make-up of the model that reflects reference to, and dependence upon, data included in the object model description, a focal point identifier identifying information in the object model as a focal point, and mapping information indicative of a mapping between entities in the object model and a persistent data store. The cited references fail to teach or suggest any generation of an analytical programming object model as claimed. For example, there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion that generation of such a model is dependent upon a focal point identifier as claimed. Claim 3 is but one example of a dependent claim believed to be allowable based on the merits of its own limitations. With the present response, Applicant has amended the dependent claims substantially in order to emphasize features that are missing from the cited references. Consideration and favorable action relative to the amended dependent claims are respectfully solicited.

With the present response, independent claim 17 has also been amended substantially. This independent claim now requires a particular data navigation provider that responds to a received data navigation request by automatically identifying a data navigation path between a set of business data in an object model and a set of business data in an analytical programming model. The analytical programming model is claimed as being separate and distinct from the object model.

It is respectfully pointed out that neither of the cited references teaches or suggests automatically identifying a data navigation path across two separate and distinct data models as claimed. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 17 is in

allowable form.

Dependent claims 18-35 are dependent upon independent claim 17 and are believed to be allowable form at least for their dependence upon what is believed to be an allowable claim. Further, it is respectfully submitted that some or all of these dependent claims are allowable based on the merit of their own limitations. For example, Applicant invites the Examiner to review dependent claim 25. Notably, this claim incorporates the elements of intervening claims 20-24. Accordingly, claim 25 includes many limitations, quite a few of which are missing from the cited references. The claim requires that the navigation service layer be provided with an automatically derived navigation link that is indicative of the data navigation path between the business data and the object model and the business data in the analytical programming model. Further, the claim requires selection from an aggregated collection of navigation links of the automatically derived navigation link. This process is very clearly missing from the cited references. Claim 25 is but one example of a dependent claim believed to be allowable based on the merit of its own limitations. With the present response, Applicant has included a new claim that has been crafted to emphasize features that are missing from the cited references.

In summary, consideration and allowance of pending claims 1-35 and 41 are respectfully solicited. The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,

By: /christopher l holt/
Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
One Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052-6399
Phone: (425) 707-9382

CLH: rkm